

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 23, 2006 (Office Action). This response is filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, and as such, no fees are believed to be due. Nonetheless, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Each of the claims were rejected in the Office Action on new grounds as noted at page 12 of the Office Action. At pages 2-3 of the Office Action, Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 12, 22, 24, 26-29, and 32 were rejected at page 3 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2001/0042083 to Saito (hereinafter Saito), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,148 to Rowe *et al.* (hereinafter Rowe). Claims 13-21 were rejected at page 5 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,911,776 to Guck (hereinafter Guck). At page 8 of the Office Action, Claims 3, 5, 10, 11, 23, 25, 30, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Saito, in view of Rowe, and further in view Guck.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 13, 14, 22, and 33 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. Claim 33 has been further amended to address the lack of antecedent basis that was the basis of the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The amendments are supported throughout the Specification, as discussed herein. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 12, lines 2-14.) No new matter has been introduced by the amendments.

Applicants' Invention

It may be useful at this juncture to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention. One embodiment of the invention, typified by amended Claim 1, is a method for

converting formatted content, the formatting serving to extract information that is related by topic. Examples of the topics include sports scores, league standings in a sports conference, financial news highlights, high and low temperatures in certain cities, and other related information of interest according to the purpose of a particular user. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 11, line 19 – Col. 12, line 14; and p. 18, lines 1-17.)

The method can include receiving a content request from a client, the content request specifying a network location from which a specified document including formatted content can be retrieved, the content request further indicating a target format. Additionally, the method can include identifying, in response to the content request, a template which corresponds to the specified document and the target format. The identification can be based on a template identifier that corresponds to a network location identifier of the specified network location, and the template can provide at least one content marker that indicates a data offset for identifying within the specified document data that corresponds to a predetermined topic. Moreover, the template can be customized by a user to extract from the specified document, in varying combinations, information based upon the at least one content marker.

The method further can include retrieving the specified document from the specified network location, applying the template to the specified document, and extracting data from the formatted content based upon the template. The method also can include formatting the data based upon the template, wherein formatting produces a second document formatted according to the target format.

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

In the Office Action, Saito was cited with respect to each of the independent claims as teaching or suggesting a template that includes a content marker for identifying data corresponding to a particular topic. None of the other references suggest such a feature.

Saito is directed to a search template for extracting information from documents. One fundamental difference between Saito and Applicants' invention, however, is that the information extracted with Saito is explicitly "predetermined layout/characteristic information." (See, e.g., paragraphs [0035] – [0037].) Saito, as indeed Rowe, selects blocks of data, the data specifically being blocks of text or images. More particularly, Saito describes not the extraction of information or data corresponding to topics, but rather presentation information; that is, data such as font, size, and other visual presentment data. (See, e.g., Saito, paragraph [0053].)

Rowe is cited as providing the feature of an offset, but the offset does not provide a mechanism for extracting information or data on the basis of data meaning or content; that is, based on or related to a predetermined topic. Instead, Rowe describes the use of an offset for providing fragments of HTML documents. (See, e.g., Rowe, Col. 31, line 56 – Col. 23, line 24.)

Similarly, Guck focuses exclusively on the presentation of data, rather than the meaning or topic-relatedness of data. For example, as illustrated in FIG. 8 of Guck, Guck selects out presentation elements from a document. These elements are, as described in Guck, text file type, graphics, and related presentment data.

By contrast, Applicants' invention provides context, or meaning, to included content within a document, regardless of the format, or absence of such, of the particular document. Specifically, Applicants' invention provides content markers that identify content based on topics. As explicitly described, examples of such topics include sports scores, team standings in a sports league, financial news, high and low temperatures in certain cities, and other information related to a particular topic or of interest according to the purpose of a particular user. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 11, line 19 – Col. 12, line 14; and p. 18, lines 1-17. Accordingly, the data or information extracted by Applicants' invention corresponds to an underlying meaning or topic, not merely the presentation data that is the exclusive focus of each of the cited references.

Moreover, none of the cited references teach or suggest the additional feature of a user's being enabled to customize a template. In particular, none of the references teach or suggest a template that can be customized in order to extract information in one or more different combinations from a specified document, the information being extracted based upon one or more content markers as already discussed.

Accordingly, none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggest every feature recited in amended Claims 1, 13, 14, 22, and 33. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that each of the dependent claims defines over the prior art. Applicants further respectfully assert that whereas each of the remaining dependent claims depends from one of the amended independent claims, the dependent claims likewise define over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Marc A. Boillot, Registration No. 56,164
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000

Date: **June 23, 2006**